

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0156-01
Bill No.: HB 332
Subject: Agriculture and Animals
Type: Original
Date: February 11, 2011

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies the Puppy Mill Cruelty Prevention Act to include humane societies and the grandfathering of facilities as of November 2, 2011.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **Department of Agriculture (AGR)** state the legislation would require commercial dog breeders that license after November 2, 2011 to meet an additional standard of care that would increase the costs of compliance.

AGR states it is too speculative to predict the number of commercial dog breeders that will come into existence after November 2, 2011. The cost for IT-related services and products would be directly related to the number of additional personnel required to inspect the new animal care facilities, which is unknown. Therefore the impact on the agency is unknown.

Oversight assumes the estimated costs of implementing Section 273.345 RSMo. (Proposition B, 2010) that were submitted to the State Auditor, in December, 2009 would be reduced and a cost avoidance would occur since commercial dog breeders in existence before November 2, 2011 would be exempt. The amount of savings is unknown. However, the Department of Agriculture would incur costs for compliance for all additional new commercial dog breeders after November 2, 2011.

Oversight assumes the number of new commercial dog breeders after November 2nd, 2011 would be minimal and the costs associated with compliance of these new breeders could be absorbed by the department.

Officials at the **Office of Secretary of State** states many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

Oversight assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

ASSUMPTION (Continued)

Officials at the **Office of the Attorney General** assumes that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials at the **State Public Defender's Office, Office of State Courts Administrator** and **Office of Prosecution Services** assumes there is no fiscal impact from this proposed legislation.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2012 (10 Mo.)	FY 2013	FY 2014
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2012 (10 Mo.)	FY 2013	FY 2014
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Direct fiscal impact to new small commercial dog breeding businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal after November 2, 2011.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Agriculture
State Public Defender's Office
Office of Secretary of State
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of the Attorney General

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mickey Wilson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
February 11, 2011